

REMARKS

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of the subject application. Claims 1-71 and 73-81 are pending, of which claims 1-6, 11-12, 14-16, 18-19, 23, 27, 30, 51-55, 62-63, 65, 67-71, and 73-78 have been amended.

35 U.S.C. §102 Claim Rejections

Claims 1-23, 28-36, 41-50, 54-59, 60-61, and 65-75 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by a PCT, International Publication Number WO 02/17205 A2 to DO, Arthur et al. (hereinafter, “Arthur”) (*Office Action* p.2). Claim 72 is canceled and Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection of the remaining claims.

Claim 1 recites a system comprising:

a destination device configured to request data;

a tracking device configured to:

receive the request for the data from the destination device and redirect the request;

receive tracking information from the destination device when the data is provided to the destination device;

maintain the tracking information in a database;

associate the tracking information with the destination device; and

a server device configured to provide the data that includes the tracking information to the destination device, the server device further configured to receive the redirected request for the data from the tracking device.

1 Arthur does not show or disclose a tracking device that receives a request
2 for data from a destination device and redirects the request to a server device that
3 receives the redirected request and then provides the data that includes the tracking
4 information to the destination device, as recited in claim 1.

5 Arthur describes that content provider 103 (*see* Fig. 1) distributes content to
6 a publisher 107 where a tracking filter 111 tags the content for tracking purposes
7 (*Arthur* p.6, lines 1-2; page 7, lines 3-5). A Web server 113 (at publisher 107)
8 serves the content with the tracking information to requesting users, such as Web
9 browser 115 (*Arthur* p.7, lines 24-30; page 8, lines 2-4). When the Web browser
10 115 receives the content, a tracking information request is transmitted to the traffic
11 register 117 which tracks the usage of the content (*Arthur* p.8, lines 7-9).

12 Arthur does not describe or show in Fig. 1 that the tracking filter 117
13 receives a content request from the Web browser 115, and redirects the request to
14 publisher 107. As such, Arthur does not show or disclose a tracking device that
15 receives a request for data from a destination device, and redirects the request to a
16 server device, as recited in claim 1.

17 Accordingly, claim 1 is allowable over Arthur and Applicant respectfully
18 requests that the §102 rejection be withdrawn.

19
20 Claims 2-13 are allowable by virtue of their dependency upon claim 1.
21 Additionally, some or all of claims 2-13 are allowable over Arthur for independent
22 reasons. For example:

23 Claim 2 recites that the server device includes the tracking device. Arthur
24 does not show or disclose a server device that includes a tracking device as recited in
25

1 claim 2. For example, the content provider 103 in Arthur does not include traffic
2 register 117 (*see* Fig. 1). Accordingly, claim 2 is allowable over Arthur and the
3 §102 rejection should be withdrawn.

4

5 Claim 14 recites a system comprising “a tracking device configured to
6 receive a request for data from a requesting device and redirect the request for the
7 data to a data provider, the request including tracking information relating to the
8 request for the data”, and “a server device configured to receive the redirected
9 request for the data from the tracking device, and provide the data to the
10 requesting device.”

11 As described above in the response to the rejection of claim 1, Arthur does
12 not show or disclose a tracking device that receives a request for data from a
13 requesting device and redirects the request, or a server device that receives the
14 redirected request for the data from the tracking device and provides the data to
15 the requesting device, as recited in claim 14.

16 Accordingly, claim 14 is allowable over Arthur and Applicant respectfully
17 requests that the §102 rejection be withdrawn.

18

19 Claims 15-23 and 28 are allowable by virtue of their dependency upon
20 claim 14. Additionally, some or all of claims 15-23 and 28 are allowable over
21 Arthur for independent reasons. For example:

22 Claim 16 recites that the server device includes the tracking device. As
23 described above in the response to the rejection of claim 2, Arthur does not show or
24 disclose a server device that includes a tracking device as recited in claim 16. The

1 content provider 103 in Arthur does not include traffic register 117 (see Fig. 1).
2 Accordingly, claim 16 is allowable over Arthur and the §102 rejection should be
3 withdrawn.
4

5 Claim 29 recites a system comprising “a tracking component configured to
6 receive a request for content from a requesting device”, and “a content provider
7 configured to receive the request for content from the tracking component”.

8 As described above in the response to the rejection of claim 1, Arthur does
9 not show or disclose a tracking component that receives a request for content from
10 a requesting device, and a content provider that receives the request for the content
11 from the tracking component, as recited in claim 29.

12 Claim 29 also recites “the request for content including request-tracking
13 information relating to the request for content”, and that the content provided to
14 the requesting device is “content including content-tracking information relating to
15 providing the content”.

16 Arthur does not show or disclose *both* request-tracking content information
17 relating to the request for content, and content-tracking information relating to
18 providing the content, as recited in claim 29. The Office cites Arthur for teaching
19 a tracking component that receives a request for content from a requesting device,
20 the request for content including request-tracking information relating to the
21 request for content (*Office Action* p.3). Applicant disagrees because the cited
22 section of Arthur only describes receiving content that includes tracking
23 information, and a tracking information request that is not a request for the content
24
25

1 (Arthur p.3, lines 28-32). Arthur does not describe tracking content information
2 relating to the request for content, as recited in claim 29.

3 Claim 29 also recites that the tracking component associates “the
4 request-tracking information and the content-tracking information with the
5 requesting device.” Again, Arthur does not show or disclose *both* request-tracking
6 content information and content-tracking information, as recited in claim 29.

7 Accordingly, claim 29 is allowable over Arthur for at least these reasons
8 and Applicant respectfully requests that the §102 rejection be withdrawn.

9
10 Claims 30-36 and 41 are allowable by virtue of their dependency upon
11 claim 29. Additionally, some or all of claims 30-36 and 41 are allowable over
12 Arthur for independent reasons. For example:

13 Claim 30 recites that the content provider includes the tracking component.
14 As similarly described above in the response to the rejection of claims 2 and 16,
15 Arthur does not show or disclose a content provider that includes a tracking
16 component as recited in claim 30. The content provider 103 in Arthur does not
17 include traffic register 117 (*see* Fig. 1). Accordingly, claim 30 is allowable over
18 Arthur and the §102 rejection should be withdrawn.

19
20 Claim 42 recites a computing device comprising an application component
21 configured to receive a request for content, and communicate the request for content
22 to a content provider. Claim 42 also recites the request including request-tracking
23 information and the content including content-tracking information.

1 As described above in the response to the rejection of claim 29, Arthur does
2 not show or disclose *both* request-tracking information and content-tracking
3 information, as recited in claim 42.

4 Claim 42 also recites a database configured to associate the
5 request-tracking information and the content-tracking information with the
6 destination device. Arthur also does not describe any such association of
7 request-tracking information and content-tracking information, as recited in
8 claim 42.

9 Accordingly, claim 42 is allowable over Arthur for at least these reasons
10 and Applicant respectfully requests that the §102 rejection be withdrawn.

11
12 Claims 43-50 and 54 are allowable by virtue of their dependency upon
13 claim 42.
14

15 Claim 55 recites a method comprising “receiving a request for content from
16 a destination device, the request including request-tracking information relating to
17 the request for content”, and “redirecting the request for content to a content
18 provider that provides the content to a destination device, the content including
19 content-tracking information relating to providing the content.”

20 As described above in the response to the rejection of claim 1, Arthur does
21 not show or disclose receiving a request for content from a destination device and
22 redirecting the request for content to a content provider, as recited in claim 55.
23 Additionally, as described above in the response to the rejection of claim 29,
24 Arthur does not show or disclose *both* request-tracking information relating to a
25

1 request for content and content-tracking information relating to providing the
2 content, as recited in claim 55.

3 Accordingly, claim 55 is allowable over Arthur for at least these reasons
4 and Applicant respectfully requests that the §102 rejection be withdrawn.

5
6 Claims 56-61 and 65-66 are allowable by virtue of their dependency upon
7 claim 55.

8
9 Claim 67 recites “receiving a request for data from a requesting device, the
10 request including request-tracking information”, “redirecting the request for the
11 data to a data provider”, and “providing the data to the requesting device, the data
12 including content-tracking information.”

13 As similarly described above in the response to the rejection of claim 1,
14 Arthur does not show or disclose receiving a request for data from a requesting
15 device and redirecting the request for the data to a data provider, as recited in
16 claim 67. Additionally, as described above in the response to the rejection of
17 claim 29, Arthur does not show or disclose *both* request-tracking information and
18 content-tracking information, as recited in claim 67.

19 Accordingly, claim 67 is allowable over Arthur for at least these reasons
20 and Applicant respectfully requests that the §102 rejection be withdrawn.

21
22 Claims 68-71 and 73-75 are allowable by virtue of their dependency upon
23 claim 67.

1 **35 U.S.C. §103 Claim Rejections**

2 Claims 24-27, 37-40, 51-53, 62-64, and 76-78 are rejected under
3 35 U.S.C. §103(a) for obviousness over the PCT in view of U.S. Patent
4 Publication No. 2002/0116494 to Kocol (hereinafter, “Kocol”) (*Office Action*
5 p.12). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

6

7 Kocol is cited by the Office for teaching tracking information that identifies a
8 selectable data link and the rendered content that includes the selectable data link
9 (*Office Action* p.13). However, Kocol is not cited for the deficiencies of Arthur as
10 described above in response to the §102 rejections. Accordingly:

11 Claims 24-27 are allowable over the Arthur-Kocol combination by virtue of
12 their dependency upon claim 14 which is allowable over Arthur for at least the
13 reasons described above in response to the §102 rejection of claim 14.

14 Claims 37-40 are allowable over the Arthur-Kocol combination by virtue of
15 their dependency upon claim 29 which is allowable over Arthur for at least the
16 reasons described above in response to the §102 rejection of claim 29.

17 Claims 51-53 are allowable over the Arthur-Kocol combination by virtue of
18 their dependency upon claim 42 which is allowable over Arthur for at least the
19 reasons described above in response to the §102 rejection of claim 42.

20 Claims 62-64 are allowable over the Arthur-Kocol combination by virtue of
21 their dependency upon claim 55 which is allowable over Arthur for at least the
22 reasons described above in response to the §102 rejection of claim 55.

1 Claims 76-78 are allowable over the Arthur-Kocol combination by virtue of
2 their dependency upon claim 67 which is allowable over Arthur for at least the
3 reasons described above in response to the §102 rejection of claim 67.

4

5 **New Claims**

6 New claims 79-81 are presented for examination. Based on the above
7 discussion regarding Arthur and Kocol, Applicant believes that claims 79-81 are
8 also allowable. Additionally, claim 79 is allowable by virtue of its dependency
9 upon allowable claim 14, claim 80 is allowable by virtue of its dependency upon
10 allowable claim 29, and claim 81 is allowable by virtue of its dependency upon
11 allowable claim 42.

12

13 **Conclusion**

14 Pending claims 1-71 and 73-81 are in condition for allowance. Applicant
15 respectfully requests reconsideration and issuance of the subject application. If
16 any issues remain that preclude issuance of this application, the Examiner is urged
17 to contact the undersigned attorney before issuing a subsequent Action.

18

19 Respectfully Submitted,

20

21 Dated: Jan 14, 2005

22 By: 
23 David A. Morasch
24 Reg. No. 42,905
25 (509) 324-9256 x 210